

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,034,382 to *Hazel*.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants respectfully submit that the features of the present invention are not taught or suggested by the applied references of record. Accordingly, claims 1-3 are presently pending.

All Claims Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Hazel*. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not established that *Hazel* anticipates each and every feature of Applicants' claimed invention and that all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn. Independent claim 1 recites, in part, "a clincher cam rotatable about a shaft including a cam surface engageable with the movable clincher so as to rotate the movable clincher, the clincher cam being driven through a drive link directly operated by a drive mechanism for driving a staple."

The Office Action equates *Hazel* with the claimed invention. But *Hazel* does not show at least "a clincher cam rotatable about a shaft including a cam surface engageable with the movable clincher so as to rotate the movable clincher, the clincher cam being driven through a drive link directly operated by a drive mechanism for driving a staple," as recited in claim 1.

Specifically, *Hazel* does not disclose at least "the clincher cam being driven through a

drive link directly operated by a drive mechanism for driving a staple.” Hazel does not show any drive link operated by a drive mechanism for driving a staple. In fact, while the Office Action asserts that *Hazel* is capable of stapling sheets together, it cannot. The specification in *Hazel* discloses that the leads (11, 13) of an electronic component (15) are *inserted* in a hole formed in a printed circuit board 17 and positioned between trimmer elements 23 and 25. See col. 3, lines 34-38 of *Hazel*. First, the alleged staple (an electronic component 15) is inserted and not driven in *Hazel*, as driving an electronic component like a staple would damage it. Second, if the alleged drive link (shaft 45) is directly operated by a drive mechanism for driving a staple, it is a mystery how the alleged drive link (shaft 45) drives the alleged staple (an electronic component 15) in Fig. 1 of *Hazel*. There is no communication between the alleged drive link (45) and the alleged staple (15).

Further, contrary to the Office Action’s assertion that “this device [*i.e.*, *Hazel*] is certainly capable of stapling binding sheets,” it certainly is not. This assertion is pure fiction because as demonstrated above, there is no evidence of the alleged drive link (shaft 45) driving/penetrating/guiding through/ the alleged staple (15) in Fig. 1 of *Hazel*. There is no communication between the alleged drive link (45), which is merely a rotating shaft, and the alleged staple (15), which actually an electronic component, that would allow for such an action.

Accordingly, *Hazel* fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Thus, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, a claim is anticipated by a prior art reference only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of*

California, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because *Hazel* does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-3 are also allowable insofar as they recite the patentable combinations of features recited in claim 1, as well as reciting additional features that further distinguish over the applied prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the Response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: /David E. Connor/
David E. Connor
Reg. No. 59,868

Dated: March 9, 2010

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel.: (202) 739-3000
Fax: (202) 739-3001